



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,549	07/03/2001	Erno Kovacs	450117-03450	2858

20999 7590 02/15/2005

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/898,549

Applicant(s)

KOVACS ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, are presented for examination. Claims 6 and 8 are cancelled.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments regarding the amended claims filed 11/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (1) Helgeson et al., Saba Software Inc (Hereinafter, Helgeson-Saba Software), does not teach or suggest claimed limitations of claim 1, i.e., “a plurality of services respectively structured according to a model-view-controller architecture”, “providing access from a client to a multimedia service and a controller and at least one view for the presentation of the data of the model” and “Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled”. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant’s arguments. The limitations “an earlier client’s request”, “forwarding, according to the model-view-controller architecture, the request”, has been newly added. Hence, the scope of the amended claims is narrower than previously presented claims. For the argument that Helgeson-Saba Software does not disclose all the claimed limitations of claim 1, Helgeson-Saba Software very clearly discloses a plurality of services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11) respectively structured according to a model-view-controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), providing access from a client (e.g, figures 1, 3) to a multimedia service (e.g., col., 51, lines 25 – 52) and a controller (e.g., col., 51, lines 54

Art Unit: 2154

– col., 52, line 38) and at least one view for the presentation of the data of the model (col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2) Helgeson-Saba Software does not teach or suggest “MVC architecture for the communication between different services via the controller, as recited in claim 1”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies “MVC architecture for the communication between different services via the controller” are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is “the services are designed to communicate with each other by means of the controller”. Helgeson-Saba Software very clearly teaches that the services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11) are designed to communicate with each other (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), by means of the controller (e.g., col., 51, lines 54 – col., 52, line 38). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Helgeson-Saba Software meets the claimed limitations.

Applicant argues (3) Helgeson-Saba Software does not teach or suggest “the state of the controller is determined in accordance with an earlier client's request”, “forwarding according to

Art Unit: 2154

the model view controller architecture”. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Helgeson-Saba Software very clearly discloses that the state of the controller is determined in accordance with an earlier client's request (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40) and forwarding according to the model view controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 1, recites the limitations, “the data of the model”, “the services are designed”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple models and multiple different services exist in the claim, it is not clear which model and services are referred by these limitations.

5. Claim 2, recites the limitations, “the same service”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2154

6. Claim 4, recites the limitations, “the service according to the mark-up language used”.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple different services exist in the claim, it is not clear which service is referred by these limitations.

7. Claim 7, recites the limitations, “the presentation of data of the at least one model”, “the controller”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple controllers exist in the claim, it is not clear which controller is referred by these limitations.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Helgeson et al. 6,643,652 (Hereinafter Helgeson).

10. As per claims 1 and 9, Helgeson teaches the following:

portal application for implementation on a multipurpose computer for providing access from a client (e.g., figures 1, 3) to a multimedia service (e.g., col., 51, lines 25 – 52),

wherein the portal application comprises a plurality of services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11, col. 7, lines 47 – 61),

respectively structured according to the model-view-controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), and

respectively comprising at least one model containing data (e.g., database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10), a controller (e.g., col., 51, lines 54 – col., 52, line 38) and at least one view for the presentation of data of the model (col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10), wherein the services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11) are designed to communicate with each other (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40) by means of the controller (e.g., col., 51, lines 54 – col., 52, line 38, col. 11, lines 27 – 38),

a plurality of views (e.g., an application would typically also include UI components (such as JSP pages or servlets) which would use such business components, col., 27, lines 20-47), for the presentation of data of different mark-up languages (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4),

multimedia service comprises a portal application (e.g., services offered by information server, interface server, business server of the SABA business platform, figure 17),

sending a request to a first core service responsible for user management and/or administrative processing (e.g., communication between the applications, common business objects and the core services, figure 5),

forwarding, according to the model-view-controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), the request from the first core service (e.g., figure 5, block 503) to a second special service (e.g., figure 5, blocks, 529, 531), and

establishing a communication between the client and the second special service (e.g., client connection to the SABA business platform services supported by the interface server, figure 17, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract).

11. As per claims 2-5, 7, 10, Helgeson teaches the following:

a controller (e.g., Servlet, col., 27, lines 20-47) of a service is designed to select one of a plurality of views (e.g., Java Server Pages, col., 27, lines 20-47) of the service according to the mark-up language used, the state of the controller is a function of a client's request, the special services are distributed over a network (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract),

the state of the controller is determined in accordance with an earlier client's request (e.g., col., 114, lines 48 – 57, col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50,



Art Unit: 2154

line 53 – col., 51, line 40) and forwarding according to the model view controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40),

a controller of a service is designed to control at least one further controller of another or the same service (e.g., Servlet controlling another servlet handling a service , col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45),

a controller of a service is designed to control a plurality of views for different presentations (e.g., Servlet controlling multiple Java Server pages for different user services, col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45),

depending on one of the browser characteristic of the client, device characteristics, time and/or date location, language, and user preferences (e.g., depending on locales, languages, timezones, and display formats, etc., col., 7, lines 5 – 61).

### *Conclusion*

12. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

February 6, 2005

  
JOHN TOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100